



# **California Water Plan Plenary Breakout Session: Graphics – Water Supply and Balance and Environmental Water 10:00pm – 12:00pm**

## **Meeting Summary**

### **Welcome and Greetings**

Jennifer Kofoid, Department of Water Resources, opened the session. She thanked the participants for coming, especially expressing appreciation to data manipulators for attending since it is important for the people who know the data to explore the ways it is graphically portrayed. Today we will be discussing what we've covered, where we landed, and we would like your input regarding next steps. The presentation for today's session is available online.

Ms. Kofoid encouraged participants to write notes on the session handout, we will collect those at the end of this session so we have input from everyone to take away.

### **Review August 16<sup>th</sup> Workshop**

Ms. Kofoid reminded participants that the presentation from August 16<sup>th</sup> is available online for more information on what we've covered. Ms. Kofoid specifically expressed concern about including wild and scenic rivers in the North Coast, which tend to skew water data. Such water was once pulled out as dedicated water (for environmental uses) and the water balance focused on developed water at that time.

One of the things that was heard in the August 16<sup>th</sup> workshop is that it is important to be clear about which water is included in graphics. Terms like gross, net, dedicated, developed, managed, and other terms can clarify what we are including and what we are excluding. We need to be clear about the definitions we use and either provide clear explanations or use accessible, logical terms, or both.

Some questions to keep in mind as we open the floor for conversation:

- Should we use 10 or 13 years? The majority of this group preferred the most recent 10 years.
- Do we show applied, net, or both?
- What is important to include?

**Comments:**

- For the generic schematic, it would help to have something like that up front so people have a clear understanding of what is included and what is not. Since I work with the coastal areas we are confronted with beach closures because of run off.
- I think of the highlights as a visual index to the rest of the document. If I have to look at the picture and go find the words somewhere else I'm not likely to do that much work.
- You might title the full butterfly chart Statewide Water Resources instead of California's Water Resources, and point to the butterfly charts in regional reports for regional water balances.
- Think of it as a visual index and try not to make the visuals intimidating.
- The stippling I really like, but you need perhaps a key that shows why that particular amount of water in that type of water is not available.
- If we do 10 years, we need to do consecutive years.
- I like the idea of having a data table that accompanies this, we want to show the data as we gather it, and we should include all of the data.
- I think the butterfly chart was a huge advancement in Update 2009.
- The group was split down the middle with half preferring to have the data table in the highlights and half preferring to keep it in the technical location but with an inseparable text box citation that links the butterfly chart with the data that created it.

**Question:** Only the Smith and a portion of the Klamath are designated as Wild and Scenic at the Federal Level. Why is there so much Wild and Scenic water that it would skew this so badly?

**Answer:** We use the state and federal designations which include the Smith, Klamath, Eel, Trinity, Albion, Gualala, and Black Butte.

**Comments:**

- I see that you have the storage on the right side, have you considered the water put into storage. I see groundwater coming out, but I don't see it going in
- Change in storage in this chart is an arithmetic calculation, to balance the charts, not an actual.

**Question:** Is the water considered in Wild & Scenic the full flow to the ocean.

**Answer:** Mr. Moeller verified that the water in question is the full amount lost to the ocean.

**Comment:** The other thing you don't have is a total hydrologic budget.

**Response:** We did that in Update 2005, with a flow chart, but it appeared to be too much so we aren't sure about it in 2013. We do have a water balance summary table based on the hydrologic cycle in Update 2009, Volume 1 - Chapter 4 California Water Today, Table 4-2.

## **Discuss Potential Illustrations**

Ms. Kofoid, skipped further discussion of potential illustrations due to time constraints and asked participants to provide handouts with feedback ; she adjourned the meeting.